



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,965	01/28/2004	Martin Meckesheimer	03-0527	1964
64722	7590	11/27/2006	EXAMINER	
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROLMAN, P.C. 250 PARK AVENUE SUITE 825 NEW YORK, NY 10177-0899			BODDIE, WILLIAM	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2629

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/707,965	MECKESHEIMER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	William Boddie	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6-7, 14, 23-24 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/20/05, 4/9/04, 1/28/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.
2. Specifically there is no copy or portion of the Arsenault non-patent document. The Applicant has instead submitted news articles that only reference the document.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: each claim is dependent upon claim 4. However, it appears the Applicant intended these claims to be dependent on claim 5. These claims will be examined, in this office action, based on that assumption. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 14 is dependent upon claim 10. However, it appears the Applicant intended this claim to be dependent on claim 11 instead. Claim 14 will be examined, in this office action, under this assumption. Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 23 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 23 is dependent upon claim 21. However, it appears the Applicant intended this claim to be dependent on claim 22 instead. Claim 23 will be examined, in this office action, under this assumption. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2629

6. Claim 24 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 24 states, "a plurality of placard, wherein..." This is incorrect grammatically. Altering the phrase to state 'a plurality of placards, wherein...' would be an appropriate correction.

Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 32 states, "a method of using the system." This should be corrected to read, 'a method of using a system.' Additionally, line 3 of the claim states, "an customer," this in incorrect grammatically. Finally, line 10 of the claim reads, "each of the one or more placards." There is never any previous mention of "one or more placards," therefore it is inappropriate to use the article "the" when referring to "one or more placards."

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 20, 22, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically these claims call for "each plurality of placards" to be locatable etc. This is inconsistent with prior claims that only call for a single plurality of placards. In other words, the claims as currently worded require, each group of placards to be locatable. It appears that the Applicant might have intended for each placard to be locatable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-8, 17-18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Albert et al. (US 6,118,426).

**With respect to claim 1,** Albert discloses, a placard (fig. 6b for example) comprising:

a receiver (302 and 360 in fig. 6a) having a memory storing an identification code (360; col. 14, lines 33-37) and an antenna (302 in fig. 6a) for receiving a signal; a capacitor (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 22-24) coupled to the receiver; and an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the receiver and powered by the capacitor (col. 14, lines 10-17) for displaying a customer specific message when a portion of the signal matches the identification code of the placard (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

**With respect to claim 2,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the identification code of the device is a device descriptive identity (each device is given a unique identification code; this is seen as sufficiently describing the device; also note col. 14, line 36 which discloses the programming of the identification codes similar to cellular phones and beepers).

**With respect to claim 3,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the identification code of the device is a user selectable identity (col. 14, lines 33-36 discloses the use of user selectable dip switches).

**With respect to claim 4,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the identification code of the device is a unique identity (col. 14, line 34).

**With respect to claim 5,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the receiver comprises an RF receiver (clear from fig. 6a).

**With respect to claim 6,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 5 (see above), wherein the RF receiver is an active RF receiver (col. 14, lines 60-66 discloses using internal batteries to power the device; this is the only requirement for an active RF receiver according to para. 11 of the specification).

**With respect to claim 7,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 5 (see above), wherein the RF receiver is a passive RF receiver (310 in fig. 6a; also note col. 14, lines 18-21).

**With respect to claim 8,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the electronic updateable static display comprises an electronic paper display (col. 14, lines 55-60 for example).

**With respect to claim 17,** Albert discloses, a system comprising:  
one or more antennas (302 in fig. 6a);  
a transmitter for transmitting a signal (370 in fig. 6a); and

a plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 60-64), wherein each placard comprise a receiver having a memory storing an identification code (col. 14, lines 33-36) and an antenna for receiving the signal (302 in fig. 6a); a capacitor coupled to the receiver (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 21-24); and an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the receiver and powered by the capacitor for displaying a customer specific message when a portion of the signal matches the identification code of the placard (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

**With respect to claim 18,** Albert discloses, the system according to claim 17 (see above), further comprising a controller coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal (col. 17, lines 12-15; also see col. 17, line 48), wherein the signal comprises one or more identification codes (col. 14, lines 33-38), each identification code being associated with one of the plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 33-35), each identification code having associated with it a customer specific message (col. 14, lines 37-41; the customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data).

**With respect to claim 32,** Albert discloses, a method of using the system comprising:

generating a signal (col. 17, lines 12-15; also see col. 17, line 48) having one or more placard identification codes (col. 14, lines 33-38) and a customer specific message associated with each of the placard identifications (col. 14, lines 37-41; the

customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data);

transmitting the signal using a transmitter (370 in fig. 6a) and one or more antennas (note the antenna on the transmitter in fig. 6a);  
receiving the signal on an antenna coupled to a receiver (302 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 18-20);

charging a capacitor coupled to the receiver on each of the one or more placards using the energy received from the signal (col. 14, lines 18-26); and  
displaying the customer specific message on an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 27-31), which is coupled to the capacitor and the receiver (clear from fig. 6a), by using the energy from the capacitor when a portion of the one or more placard identifications is the placard receiving the signal from a database(col. 14, lines 33-41).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter APA).

**With respect to claim 9,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein the electronic updateable static display comprises a photonic ink display.

APA discloses the use of a specific type of electronic paper, photonic ink (para. 8).

APA and Albert are analogous art because they are both drawn to the same field of endeavor namely electronic paper types.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use photonic ink, taught by APA, in the electronic paper displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been the ability of photonic ink to generate any wavelength with simply a difference in voltage applied (APA; bottom of para. 8).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine APA with Albert for the benefit of a simple color display to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

14. Claims 10-14 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Gelbman (US 6,753,830)

**With respect to claim 10,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

The embodiment previously discussed by Albert does not expressly disclose, a message memory coupled to a receiver, for storing one or more messages.

Gelbman discloses, electronic ink labels comprising a message memory (28 in fig. 2) coupled to the receiver (22 in fig. 2) for storing one or more messages for

displaying upon the electronic updatable static display (abstract; also see col. 5, lines 54-60).

Gelbman and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely wirelessly updateable displays, which operate with power gained from radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the message memory of Gelbman in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a series of indicia to be displayed for a finite time period (Gelbman; col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Gelbman with Albert for the benefit of storing a series of displays in the display sign to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

**With respect to claim 11,** Albert and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, a power source (60 for example in fig. 5) for powering the message memory (col. 12, lines 3-9).

**With respect to claim 12,** Albert and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 11 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, wherein the power source comprises a solar cell or a battery (col. 12, lines 3-9).

**With respect to claim 13,** Albert and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, a timer (24 in fig. 2) coupled to the message memory for initiating the one or more messages upon the electronic updateable static display (col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 4).

**With respect to claim 14,** Albert and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, wherein the power source supplements the capacitor for changing, clearing or resetting the display (col. 12, lines 4-9; specifically note the disclosure concerning a combination of on-board and off-board sources).

**With respect to claim 39,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, a function to set the display with a void, clear, opaque or dark screen.

Gelbman discloses, a function for commanding an electronic updateable static display to be set with a void, clear, opaque or dark screen (col. 18, line 22 for example).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a function for commanding a blank display screen, as taught by Gelbman, on the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need for manually erasing old information displayed for each item or group of items (Gelbman; col. 18, lines 43-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Gelbman and Albert for the benefit of eliminating the need to manually erase old information, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 39.

15. Claims 15-16, 24-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Ehrenberger et al. (US 5,785,283).

**With respect to claim 15,** Albert discloses, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein the receiver comprises a transponder.

Ehrenberger discloses wherein a receiver comprises a transponder (note transceiver 146 in fig. 2).

Ehrenberger and Albert are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely display systems receiving display data via radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Ehrenberger with Albert for the benefit of ensuring data reception to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

**With respect to claim 16,** Albert and Ehrenberger disclose, the placard according to claim 15 (see above).

Ehrenberger further discloses, wherein the signal is acknowledged by the transponder after the electronic updateable display has displayed the customer specific message (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

**With respect to claim 24,** Albert discloses, a system comprising:  
one or more antennas (note the antenna above the transmitter in fig. 6a);  
a transmitter coupled to the one or more antennas for transmitting a signal (370 in fig. 6a); and

a plurality of placard (col. 14, lines 60-64), wherein each placard comprises a receiver having a memory (360 in fig. 6a) storing an identification code (col. 14, lines 33-36) and an antenna (302 in fig. 6a) for receiving; a capacitor coupled to the transponder (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 21-24); and an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the transponder and powered by the capacitor for displaying a customer specific message when a portion of the signal matches the identification code of the device (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

Albert does not expressly disclose that an acknowledgement signal is sent by a transponder in the placard, or that such a signal is received by a transceiver.

Ehrenberger discloses, a digital radio transmission system comprising, a transceiver (212 in fig. 2) that both sends and receives signal via an antenna (note the antenna attached to the transceiver in fig. 2) to a plurality of HOT units (132 in fig. 2).

The HOT units are further capable of acknowledging a signal (440 in fig. 4) by responding to the 212-transceiver using the transceiver of the HOT unit.

Ehrenberger and Albert are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely display systems receiving display data via radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Ehrenberger with Albert for the benefit of ensuring data reception to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

**With respect to claim 25,** Albert and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 24 (see above).

Ehrenberger further discloses, wherein the signal is acknowledged after the electronic updateable display has displayed the customer specific message (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

**With respect to claim 26,** Albert and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 25 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the signal comprises one or more identification codes, each identification code being associated with one of the plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 33-36), each identification code having associated with it a customer

specific message (col. 14, lines 37-41; the customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data).

Ehrenberger further discloses, a controller (204 in fig. 2) coupled to the transmitter (212 in fig. 2) for generating a signal.

**With respect to claim 33,** Albert discloses, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, transmitting a return signal indicative of the electronic updateable static display having been set with the transmitted message.

Ehrenberger discloses, a digital radio transmission system comprising, a transceiver (212 in fig. 2) that both sends and receives signal via an antenna (note the antenna attached to the transceiver in fig. 2) to a plurality of HOT units (132 in fig. 2). The HOT units acknowledge the correct display of a received signal (440 in fig. 4) by responding to the 212-transceiver using the transceiver of the HOT unit (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Ehrenberger with Albert for the benefit of ensuring data reception to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

16. Claims 19 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Isomichi et al. (US 6,633,225).

**With respect to claim 19,** Albert discloses, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein the customer specific message displayed on the electronic updateable static display comprises a seat identification and a user selected name.

Isomichi discloses, an airline passenger paging system comprising a plurality of wireless addressed a/v units (1 in fig. 1), each of which displays a passenger's name, flight number, and seat number (col. 5, lines 1-4).

Isomichi and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely individually addressable display devices that are updated via radio communication.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the placards of Albert as airline passenger pagers, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert for the benefit of informing specific airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

**With respect to claim 36,** Albert discloses, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein the signal having a customer specific message is associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer.

Isomichi discloses, a plurality of pagers which retrieve customer specific messages that are associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer (col. 5, lines 1-2, 11-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve customer specific messages, for the displays of Albert, that are associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to individually inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60; also see col. 4, lines 51-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert for the benefit of informing specific airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

**With respect to claim 37,** Albert discloses, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Albert further discloses, using the radio signs in airports and train stations (col. 14, lines 60-61).

Albert does not expressly disclose, retrieving the customer specific message from an airline reservation or boarding system.

Isomichi discloses, a plurality of pagers which retrieve customer specific messages from an airline reservation or boarding system (col. 4, lines 35-50).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve customer specific messages for the displays of Albert from an airline system as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert for the benefit of informing airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

17. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 4,896,209).

**With respect to claim 20,** Albert discloses, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein each of the plurality of placards are visibly locatable and associative with a plurality of seating positions.

Matsuzaki discloses, a passenger vehicle polling system wherein each of a plurality of a/v units (each 35 in fig. 3) that are visibly locatable (clear from fig. 3) and associative with a plurality of seating positions (clear from fig. 7).

Matsuzaki and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, wireless transmission of display signals to a plurality of displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the placards of Albert in visibly locatable positions as well as associable with a plurality of seating positions, as taught by Matsuzaki.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to entertain passengers during long duration flights (Matsuzaki; col. 1, lines 15-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Matsuzaki for the benefit of passenger entertainment to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

**With respect to claim 21,** Albert and Matsuzaki disclose, the system according to claim 20 (see above).

Matsuzaki further discloses, wherein each device is coupled to a seat (clear from fig. 3).

**With respect to claim 22,** Albert discloses, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Albert does not expressly disclose, wherein each of the plurality of placards are visibly locatable and associative with a plurality of seating positions.

Matsuzaki discloses, a passenger vehicle polling system wherein each of a plurality of a/v units (35 in fig. 3) that are visibly locatable (clear from fig. 3) and associative with a plurality of seating positions (clear from fig. 7).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the placards of Albert in visibly locatable positions as well as associative with a plurality of seating positions, as taught by Matsuzaki.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to entertain passengers during long duration flights (Matsuzaki; col. 1, lines 15-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Matsuzaki for the benefit of passenger entertainment to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

**With respect to claim 23,** Albert and Matsuzaki disclose, the system according to claim 22 (see above).

Matsuzaki further discloses, wherein each device is coupled to a seat (clear from fig. 3).

18. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Ehrenberger et al. (US 5,785,283) and further in view of Isomichi et al. (US 6,633,225).

**With respect to claim 27,** Albert and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 26 (see above).

Neither Ehrenberger nor Albert expressly disclose, wherein the customer specific message displayed on the electronic updateable static display comprises a seat identification and a user selected name.

Isomichi discloses, an airline passenger paging system comprising a plurality of wireless addressed a/v units (1 in fig. 1), each of which displays a passenger's name, flight number, and seat number (col. 5, lines 1-4).

Isomichi, Ehrenberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, wireless transmission of display signals to a plurality of individually addressable displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the placards of Albert and Ehrenberger as airline passenger pagers, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert and Ehrenberger for the benefit of informing specific airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

19. ~~Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Ehrenberger et al. (US 5,785,283) and further in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 4,896,209).~~

**With respect to claims 28-31,** Albert and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 26 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Ehrenberger expressly disclose, associating the placards with seats.

Matsuzaki, Ehrenberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, wireless transmission of display signals to a plurality of displays.

As the remaining limitations of claims 28-31 are identical to those recited in claims 20-23, these claims are rejected on the same merits shown above in the rejection of claims 20-23.

20. Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Briechle et al. (US 5,977,998).

**With respect to claim 34,** Albert discloses, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above), further comprising receiving a stream of messages, with information as to how to transition between the messages (col. 19, lines 51-55), and displaying an updated message when a timer expires (for example see col. 7, lines 47-58) and displaying updated messaged by using energy from the capacitor or from a backup power source (col. 14, lines 64-66).

Albert does not expressly disclose, waiting for a specified period by using a timer coupled to a memory that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the electronic updateable static display.

Briechle discloses, waiting for a specified period (dwell time; fig. 12) by using a timer (69 in fig. 6; LCD driver is supplied the data registers, and as such decodes the time between display updating; col. 8, lines 38-43) coupled to a message memory (70 in fig. 6) that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the electronic updateable static display (clear from fig. 16).

Briechle and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, an extensive network of individually addressable displays that are updateable.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the timing circuitry of Briechle in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to allow the display of a string of characters that might be too large for a single screen (Briegle; col. 1, lines 36-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Briegle with Albert for the benefit of coherently displaying messages which require more than one screen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

**With respect to claim 35,** Albert and Briegle disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 34 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the backup power source is a battery or a solar cell coupled to the display (col. 14, lines 65-66).

21. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Briegle et al. (US 5,977,998) and further in view of Isomichi et al. (US 6,633,225).

**With respect to claim 38,** Albert and Briegle disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 34 (see above).

Briegle further discloses, storing the messages (82a-85d in fig. 7) in the message memory (70 in fig. 6).

Neither Albert nor Briegle disclose, that the messages are retrieved from an In-Flight Entertainment, airline reservation or boarding system.

Isomichi discloses, a plurality of pagers which retrieve customer specific messages from an airline reservation or boarding system (col. 4, lines 35-50).

Isomichi, Briechle and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely an extensive network of individually addressable displays that are updateable.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve customer specific messages for the displays of Albert and Briechle from an airline system as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert and Briechle for the benefit of informing airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

### ***Conclusion***

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pho et al. (US 6,94,481) discloses, the use of a projector to project a seat number onto a reserved seat in an airplane.
23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Boddie whose telephone number is (571) 272-0666. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 - 4:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wlb  
11/21/06

AMR A. AWAD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

